Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

	Original		Updated		Correcte	ed		Supple	emental
LRB	Number	09-1033/1		Intro	duction	Number	SE	3-040	
		campaigns for t	ne office of justice	of the s	upreme c	ourt, making	appro	priation	ıs, and
Fiscal	Effect								
	No State Fisc Indeterminate Increase E Appropriat Decrease Appropriat	Existing ions Existing	☐ Increase E Revenues ☑ Decrease Revenues	Existing	180	☑Increase (to absorb ☑Y ☑Decrease	within 'es	agency	
	No Local Gov Indeterminate 1. Increase Permiss 2. Decrease	e Costs ive Mandato	3. Increase F ry Permissive 4. Decrease	e∏Mar Revenu	ndatory e	5.Types of Lo Governmen Towns Countin School District	nt Units es	s Affect Village Others WTCS District	Cities O
Fund S	Sources Affe	PRO]PRS 🏻 SEG	☐ SE		cted Ch. 20 0.855(4)(b), s		-	
Agend	y/Prepared E	Зу	Auth	orized S	Signature	•			Date
DOR/	Bradley Carut	h (608) 261-89	84 Rebe	cca Bol	dt (608) 2	66-6785		l	4/15/2009

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOR 4/15/2009

LRB Number 09-1033/1	Introduction Number	SB-040	Estimate Type	Original
Description Public financing of campaigr providing penalties	ns for the office of justice of the	e supreme co	urt, making appro	opriations, and

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under current law, the Wisconsin election campaign fund (WECF) is financed through designations made by taxpayers on their individual income tax forms. Every individual filing an income tax return, whether receiving a refund or possessing a tax liability, may designate \$1 of general purpose revenue for transfer to the WECF. Individuals filing a joint return may each separately choose to designate \$1 for transfer to the fund. All moneys transferred to the fund are placed in accounts for specified state offices (including justice of the supreme court), and candidates for those offices may qualify for grants from the fund to be used for specified campaign expenses. No moneys in the fund may be used for any other purpose.

This bill excludes candidates for justice of the supreme court from receiving funds from the WECF, but also creates the democracy trust fund (DTF) specifically for financing elections for justice of the supreme court. The bill changes the individual income tax designation amount for the WECF from \$1 to \$3 and stipulates that designated amounts are allocated between the WECF (one-third) and the DTF (two-thirds).

Based on WECF checkoff donations made on 2007 returns, approximately 202,000 taxpayers designated the \$1 transfer under current law. Assuming the same number of taxpayers would designate the \$3 transfer, total designations would increase by approximately \$404,000 (202,000 x \$2). Under the allocation formula in the bill, the WECF is expected to receive the same total allocation as under current law, while the DTF is expected to be allocated the full increase of \$404,000. This will decrease general program revenue by \$404,000.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2009 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	\boxtimes	Original		Updated			Corrected		Supplemental
L	RB I	Number	09-103	3/1		Intro	duction Nu	ımber	SB-040
Pı ar	nd pro	inancing of oviding pena	lties					····	g appropriations,
		ized fiscal		impacts for	Stat	e and/or	Local Gover	illient (u	o not include in
11.	Ann	ualized Cos	ts:				Annualized F	iscal Imp	act on funds from
L							Increased Cos	sts	Decreased Costs
A.		e Costs by							
Ц			- Salaries a	nd Fringes				\$	\$
Ц		Position Ch							
Ш	State	Operations	- Other Cos	sts					
Ш		l Assistance							
Ц			s or Organiz						
Ш	TC	OTAL State	Costs by C	ategory				\$	\$
B.			Source of F	unds					
Ц	GPR	····							
Ц	FED								
Ц	PRO	/PRS							
Ш	SEG	/SEG-S						<u>l</u>	
				e this only w decrease in li			l will increase ts.)	e or decre	ease state
L							Increased R	ev	Decreased Rev
Ц	GPR	Taxes						\$	\$-404,000
Ш	GPR	Earned							
Ц	FED								
Ц	PRO	/PRS							
Ц	SEG	/SEG-S					404,00	00	
Ц	TC	TAL State	Revenues				\$404,0	00	\$-404,000
L				NET ANNUA	LIZI	ED FISC	AL IMPACT		
							Sta		<u>Local</u>
┝—		HANGE IN C			_			\$	\$
N	ET CH	HANGE IN F	REVENUE					\$0 <u> </u>	\$
Ad	gency	//Prepared	Bv		Aut	horized	Signature		Date
•		· •	- , th (608) 261	-8984			ldt (608) 266-6	6785	4/15/2009
Removies	_								

Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

Original	Updated	Correc	oted	Supplemental
LRB Number 09-1033	/1	Introductio	n Number S	B-040
Description Public financing of campaigns for providing penalties	or the office of justice	of the supreme	court, making app	ropriations, and
Fiscal Effect				
State: No State Fiscal Effect Indeterminate Increase Existing Appropriations Decrease Existing Appropriations Create New Appropria	☐ Increase E Revenues ☐ Decrease Revenues tions	Existing		s - May be possible n agency's budget \tilde{\tilde
Local: No Local Government Co Indeterminate 1. Increase Costs Permissive Mand 2. Decrease Costs Permissive Mand	3. Increase Fatory Permissive 4. Decrease	e Mandatory	5.Types of Local Government Un Towns Counties School Districts	nits Affected Village Cities Others WTCS Districts
Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO	PRS SEG	Aff	fected Ch. 20 App	ropriations
Agency/Prepared By	Auth	orized Signatu	ire	Date
GAB/ Jonathan Becker (608) 26	7-0647 Kevir	n Kennedy (608) 266-8005	4/12/2009

Fiscal Estimate Narratives GAB 4/12/2009

LRB Number	09-1033/1	Introduction Number	SB-040	Estimate Type	Original
Description Public financin providing pena		e office of justice of the	e supreme co	urt, making approp	oriations, and

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This legislation establishes a means of providing public funds for candidates for Supreme Court Justice in primary and general election campaigns through the democracy trust fund, a segregated fund established by the legislation. The legislation establishes detailed criteria for qualifying for publicly funded grants from the fund. It also establishes a series of matching grants if a qualified candidate accepting a grant is opposed by a non-qualifying candidate or if the qualifying candidate is targeted by a significant amount of independent expenditures.

These detailed criteria will require the dedication of the equivalent of a full time resource to monitor compliance and ensure that all disbursements are timely distributed. The individual assigned to this project will have to audit reports, including special reports mandated by the legislation and direct the State Treasurer to make the proper disbursements in a timely manner. The work would be full time from January of an election for Supreme Court Justice through the following August. In addition, significant time would be dedicated to monitoring reports and determining eligibility from July preceding an election for Supreme Court Justice through December before the election.

Currently the agency has three full-time staff dedicated to auditing all campaign finance reports to ensure compliance with existing regulations. This function has been understaffed for more than a decade as campaign receipts and expenditures have skyrocketed. The addition of a full-time campaign auditor will ensure that the requirements of the legislation are met and enable the agency address a backlog of audits.

An additional campaign auditor will cost approximately \$35,000 in salary, \$14,000 in fringe and \$4,000 in support costs annually. In addition there would be one-time set up costs of \$5,000 for the position.

The democracy trust fund would require an infusion of as much as \$2,800,000 in a contested election for Supreme Court Justice. Each qualifying candidate would be eligible for up to \$100,000 in campaign grants for the primary and \$300,000 in campaign grants for the election. If there are three qualifying candidates in the primary and two in the election the total amount of funding required would not exceed \$900,000.

However, if a qualifying candidate is opposed by non-qualifying candidates who exceed the spending limit by more than the amount of the grant, the qualifying candidate could receive an additional \$300,000 in the primary and \$900,000 in the election. If the qualifying candidate is targeted by independent expenditures that exceed the spending limit, the qualifying candidate could receive as much as an additional \$300,000 in the primary and \$900,000 in the election.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Historically only a small number of elections for Supreme Court Justice are contested in a 10 year period. This has changed in recent years. The incentives in the legislation could lead to an increased number of contested Supreme Court rces and keep spending to a scenario in which all candidates qualify for public funds. This would increase the administrative impact on agency staff to track qualification for and adherence with the detailed fundraising and reporting requirements, and would increase the potential outlay from the democracy trust fund.

Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

Original Updated	Corrected	Supplemental
LRB Number 09-1033/1	Introduction Number	er SB-040
Description Public financing of campaigns for the office of providing penalties	f justice of the supreme court, makir	ng appropriations, and
Fiscal Effect		
Appropriations R Decrease Existing D	ecrease Existing to absor	e Costs - May be possible b within agency's budget Yes \square No e Costs
Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Decrease Costs 4. D	5.Types of Governm crease Revenue ermissive Mandatory ecrease Revenue ermissive Mandatory Distri	ent Units Affected as Village Cities aties Others ol WTCS
Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS	Affected Ch. 2	0 Appropriations
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date
INV/ Sandy Drew (608) 261-0182	Sandy Drew (608) 261-0182	4/13/2009

Fiscal Estimate Narratives INV 4/13/2009

LRB Number	09-1033/1	Introduction Number	SB-040	Estimate Type	Original			
Description Public financing providing penal	Description Public financing of campaigns for the office of justice of the supreme court, making appropriations, and							

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Senate Bill (SB) 40 establishes the Democracy Trust Fund and requires the State of Wisconsin Investment Board (SWIB) to invest the fund's assets. As with all other funds that SWIB manages, any costs incurred will be charged back to the Democracy Trust Fund on a pro-rated basis. Enactment of SB 40 will have no fiscal effect on SWIB's operational budget.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

None